Uttar Pradesh; if so, what are their findings and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI G. S. DHILLON): (a) For undertaking effective relief measures as and when the need arises, margin money has been allotted to every State by the Finance Commission. The Government of Uttar Pradesh has a margin money of Rs. 32.50 crores. The Government of India has already released its share of the margin money namely Rs. 16.25 crores to facilitate relief measures.

(b) The Chief Minister, U.P. by his letter of 25-7-87 requested for a ways and means advance of Rs. 50|- crores only. Subsequently the Revenue Minister of the Uttar Pradesh State Government revised his request to Rs. 100|- crore by his letter of 7th August, 1987.

(c) 12th August, 1987; However, the memorandum containing State Government's specific proposals was received on the 16th August, 1987 and these proposals are under the consideration of the Government of India.

(d) An assessment Team which visited the States from the 6th to the 8th August, 1987 had recommended the release of central share of margin money.

Misuse of Funds meant for Natural Calamities and Anti-Poverty Programme

*371. SHRI J. P. GOYAL: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that many State Governments have misused funds or have incurred irregular expenditure running into lakhs of rupees out of the funds meant for anti-poverty programme under the Integrated Rural Development Programmes;

b) whether Government are also aware that some State Governments have not properly utilised the funds for relief of distress caused by natural calamities;

(c) if so, what are the details in respect of parts (a) and (b) above; and

(d) what is the Government's reaction thereto and what action have been taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI G. S. DHILLON):

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) (i) Details in respect of (a) above are as under:

A test review of implementation of IRD Programme in most of the States was undertaken in 1983-84 whereupon irregularities in implementation as well as expenditure incurred on activities not admissible under IRD Programme has been detected from the reports of State Accountant Generals and incorporated in the CAG report for the year 1983-84. The instances highlighted cover programmes period 1978-79 to 1983-84. CAG findings were discussed by the PAC in 1985 and departmental evidence evaluated.

It was found that in the 17 States| UTs more than Rs. 16 crores was spent on schemes not connected with IRDP or on items which are unrelated to IRDP. In a number of States, cases of payment of stipend at rates higher than admissible under TRYSEM were also noticed.

(ii) Details in respect of (b) above are as under:

Central Monitoring Teams (CMT) have visited Uttar Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh and Kerala recently to monitor utilisation of relief assistance. A large number of irregularities|shortcomings have been revealed during the monitoring. The glaring irregularities/shortcoming observed by CMT are listed below:

(1) Claims about the area affected by drought and floods have been grossly exaggerated;

(2) amounts available for drought relief have been spent in non-drought affected districts;

(3) amounts for employment generation have been spent long after the need for employment arising out of drought was over;

(4) amounts available for employment generation have been spent on activities which have generated minimal employment (e.g. drilling of bore wells on private fields);

(5) relief assistance has been utilised for activities not connected with relief;

(6) State Governments have drawn Central assistance on the basis of anticipated expenditure which was not likely to and did not materialise; large amounts have been over-drawn;

(7) amounts avaiable for repair of houses have been utilised for construction of entirely new houses apparently because assistance was availed of on the basis of exaggerated claims of damage to houses;

(8) with assistance for repairs of school buildings, new school buildings have been constructed apparently for the same reason as above.

(d) (i) Parawise comments of details in respect of c(i) above are as under:

Union Government has taken a very serious view with regard to irregularities committed in execution of IRDP. Administrative disciplinary action has been taken against the erring employees. States have been requested to be firm in dealing with such instances of irregular expenditure. In most cases where technical lapses of non-availability of prior clearance from the State Level Coordination Committee resulted in audit objection, the expenditure have been ratified by subsequent clearances obtained in the matter. Also, all identified expenses incurred for purposes outside the objectives of IRDP are being adjusted from the concerned State Governments.

As regards payment of stipend at rates higher than those admissible under TRYSEM, matter is under investigation with the respective District Rural Development Agencies and Department of Rural Development are in touch with the concerned DRDAs for detailed report of such investigations.

Legal action has been initiated against all those found guility in CBI enquiry report. Responsibility of the Bihar Government employees will be fixed after receipt of Vigilance Deparment report and administrative/legal action will be intiated against delinquent|guilty employees thereupon.

(ii) The findings of Central Monitoring Team on utilisation of relief assistance have been communicated to the concerned State Governments. The position will be reviewed on receipt of the views|comments from the State Governments.

Drinking water in Hilly tribal villages of M.P.

*372. SHRI AJIT P. K. JOGI: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) what special assistance has been given to the State of Madhya Pradesh for providing drinking water to the villages severely affected by water scracity;

(b) whether Government plan to pay special attention to the hilly tri-